IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.K.DENESAN

TUESDAY, THE 27TH MARCH 2007 / 6TH CHAITHRA 1929

WP(C).No. 10616 of 2007(L)

PETITIONER:

---

1. SHANTY GEORGE, W/O PETER,
   THAKARAPPILLIL HOUSE, NARAKAKKANAM,
   IDUKKI DISTRICT NOW RESIDING AT PARAKANDATHIL,
   KATTAPPANA, IDUKKI DISTRICT.

2. MINI JOSEPH, D/O.LATE SHRI JOSEPH,
   ALUMMOOTTIL HOUSE, PERUMTHOTTY P.O.,
   CHANDANAKAVALA, IDUKKI DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.M.K.SHASHI KUMAR

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD
   REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, SECRETARIAT,
   THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. THE CHIEF ENGINEER (H.R.M.),
   VYDYUDHI BHAVAN, PATTOM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

3. THE DEPUTY CHIEF ENGINEER,
   K.S.E.BOARD, VAZHATHOPE, IDUKK DISTRICT.

4. THE DEPUTY CHIEF ENGINEER,
   GENERAL CIRCLE, K.S.E.BOARD, MOOLAMATTOM,
   IDUKKI DISTRICT.

5. THE DIRECTOR,
   SOCIAL WELFARE DEPARTMENT, VIKAS BHAVAN,
   5TH FLOOR, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY SC SHRI. K.S. ANIL

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 27/03/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

K.K. DENESAN, J.

= = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =

W.P.(C) No.10616 OF 2007 L

= = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =

Dated this the 27th March, 2007

J U D G M E N T

The petitioners, it is stated, are physically challenged persons. They were employed as temporary hands in the service of the 1st respondent. It is contended that after termination of their service, respondents 1 to 4 have not paid any heed to the request of the petitioners for reinstatement in service though the Government have issued various orders promising such reinstatement and regularisation in service. The petitioners have approached the 5th respondent-Director of Social Welfare Department on the assumption that their grievance can be redressed by the 5th respondent. At the same time the petitioners have approached the 2nd respondent also with Exts. P9 and P10 representations.

2. It is not understood whether the 1st respondent has adopted the Government Orders pertaining to re-employment of physically challenged persons appointed on temporary basis. That is a matter for the 2nd respondent to verify, and thereafter, to consider the

request made by the petitioners in Exts. P9 and P10.

3. The 2nd respondent is therefore directed to consider Exts. P9 and P10 on merits and take decision in accordance with law and communicate the same to the petitioner as early as possible, in any event, within two months from the date of receipt of a copy of the judgment.

The petitioners shall produce a copy of the judgment and a copy of the writ petition for information and compliance.

K.K. DENESAN
JUDGE

jan/